

JAN 06 2006

Thus, Krishna and Green do not teach or suggest all features recited in claims 1, 14, and 27 of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 14, and 27 as being unpatentable over Krishna in view of Green has been overcome.

In view of the arguments above, independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15, 17-20, 22-26, 28, 30-33, and 35-39 are dependent claims depending on independent claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively. Consequently, claims 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15, 17-20, 22-26, 28, 30-33, and 35-39 also are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence on allowable claims.

B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Dependent Claims 3, 16, and 29)

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 3, 16, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna in view of Green and further in view of Evans et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,836,884 B1 ("Evans"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As shown in Section A above, neither Krishna nor Green teach or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 27 of the present invention. In particular, Krishna and Green do not teach or suggest removing all references to software that is defined in a second object-oriented software package as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 27. This feature also is not taught or suggested by Evans.

Therefore, because Krishna, Green, and Evans do not teach or suggest removing all references to software that is defined in a second object-oriented software package as recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 27, the combination of Krishna, Green, and Evans cannot teach or suggest this recited feature. As a result, dependent claims 3, 16, and 29 of the current invention also are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence upon allowable claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3, 16, and 29 as being unpatentable over Krishna in view of Green and further in view of Evans has been overcome.

C. GROUND OF REJECTION 3 (Dependent Claims 8, 21, and 34)

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 8, 21, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna in view of Green and further in view of obviousness. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As shown in Section A above, neither Krishna nor Green teach or suggest all the features

BEST AVAILABLE COPY